UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,827	11/26/2003	Heber MacMahon	245430US-20	4777
22850 7590 02/18/2011 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER	
			LAMPRECHT, JOEL	
ALEAANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/721,827	MACMAHON ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	JOEL M. LAMPRECHT	3737		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/17 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-11,13 and 22-32 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-19,21 and 33-38 is 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-11,13 and 22-32 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	s/are withdrawn from consideration	on.		
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/17/2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-11, 13, and 22-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluri et al (US 7,263,214 B2) in view of Reeves et al (2004/0184647 A1).

Uppaluri et al disclose a method and system for obtaining dual and multiple dualenergy images, extracting features of those images, and processing those regions to
determine edges (Col 4 Line 10-Col 6 Line 35), abnormalities, motion artifacts (Col 2
Line 40-Col 3 Line 45), and classify those images for display (Fig 9) to a diagnostician.
Uppaluri et al disclose methods which include break-point analysis, histogram display,
normalization, feature classification (Col 5 Line 50-Col 6 Line 65), edge smoothing,
subtraction (Fig 2), segmentation and thresholding (Col 5 Line 20-49), and also
candidate pixel identification algorithms for feature extraction.

Uppaluri et al discloses what is listed above, but fails to disclose the result of the classification as either a misregistration/motion artifact OR that of an abnormality associated with a pathological change, symbol display/highlighting for artifacts/pathologies, or break levels for gray-level processing (thresholding). Attention is directed to the newly added reference to Reeves et al et al which discloses first a method for highlighting and processing images to classify and define regions of interest (Abs, 0010-0015, 0026) in order to highlight those regions as artifacts or pathology (0106 0141-0150 and 0157-0163, 0016 for motivation). The images of Reeves et al are preferably taken at time periods far enough apart to allow for pathological change as the growth rate assists in the identification of pathology (0016, claims 1-2). Reeves et al

Art Unit: 3737

discloses histogram processing (0164-0194), thresholding (gray scale) (0033-0048, 0164-0194) and cyclical processing for registration, identification and feature identification in an image (0169-0180). While the techniques of Reeves are performed on combined images rather than dual-energy subtracted images, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized the processing techniques for identification of regions of interest with the methods and system of Uppaluri et al for the purpose of performing computer aided diagnosis (CAD) in multiple energy images (Abstract, Summary, Uppaluri and 0016-0017 of Reeves).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure includes references to Guracar et al (US 2004/0225218, Ferrant (US 2004/0105527 A1) and Schomacker et al (US 7,282,723 B2) which all disclose processing methods for automated identification of various pathologies from artifacts.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOEL M. LAMPRECHT whose telephone number is (571)272-3250. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,827 Page 5

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRIAN CASLER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737

JML